UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, : Docket #23-cr-00251

Plaintiff, :

-against- :

CHARLIE JAVICE, : New York, New York

May 22, 2023

Defendant.

-----:

PROCEEDINGS BEFORE
THE HONORABLE GABRIEL W. GORENSTEIN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiff: UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

BY: DINA MCLEOD, ESQ. 1 St. Andrew's Plaza New York, New York 10007

For Defendant: QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN

BY: ALEX SPIRO, ESQ.

MAAREN ALIA SHAH, ESQ. SAMUEL P. NITZE, ESQ. 51 Madison Avenue 22nd Floor New York, New York 10010

Transcription Service: Marissa Mignano Transcription

Phone: (631) 813-9335

E-mail:marissamignano@gmail.com

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording; Transcript produced by transcription service

Case 1:23-cr-00251-AKH		Document 25	Filed 06/30/23	Page 2 of	12	
		IN	<u>DEX</u>			
	E X A M I N A T I O N S					
	<u>Witness</u> None	<u>Direct</u>		Re- <u>Direct</u>	Re- Cross	
	<u>EXHIBITS</u>					
	Exhibit Number De	scription	-	<u>ID</u> <u>In</u>	Voir <u>Dire</u>	

None

```
1
              THE DEPUTY CLERK: Good morning.
                                                 This is
 2
     in the matter of US versus Charlie Javice, Case
     Number 23-cr-251.
 3
              Starting with the Government, please state
 4
 5
     your appearance for the record.
              MS. MCLEOD: Good morning, Your Honor.
 6
 7
     Dina McLeod for the Government.
 8
              MR. SPIRO: And good morning, Your Honor.
 9
     This is Alex Spiro. I'm joined by my colleagues
10
     Maaren Shah and Sam Nitze from Quinn Emanuel, and my
11
     client is also present.
12
              THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Javice, can you --
13
     I'm sorry. Ms. Javice, can you hear us?
14
              THE DEFENDANT: I can, Your Honor.
15
              THE COURT: All right. Did we get
16
     appearance for the Government? I'm sorry. I've
17
     been doing a million things --
18
              MS. MCLEOD: Yes, Your Honor. This is
     Dina McLeod for the Government.
19
20
              THE COURT: Okay. So, Ms. Javice, do you
21
     understand you have the right to have this
22
     proceeding take place in person? And is it correct
23
     that you have chosen and are agreeing to have it
24
     take place by video?
25
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
```

THE COURT: We're here for an arraignment.

Is that correct?

MR. SPIRO: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I have before me an indictment. Appears it was filed May 18th. The charge in Count One is that from June 2021 through

November 2022, the defendant conspired with others

to commit the crimes of wire fraud and bank fraud.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The charge in Count Two is a charge during the same period of wire fraud, specifically that the defendant engaged in a scheme to defraud by submitting false and fraudulent statements and representations about Frank and its user data, among other things to potential acquiring companies, including JPMorgan Chase, a certain bank, in order to defraud those companies out of millions of dollars consisting of the acquisition price, as well as salary, bonus and other compensation paid to Javice as a retained employee at the eventual acquiring company JPMC. And in furtherance of the scheme, the defendant transmitted and caused to be transmitted electronic communications and monetary transfers to and from the Southern District of New York.

The charge in Count Three is a charge of

1 bank fraud in the same time period, specifically 2 charging that Javice engaged in a scheme to defraud 3 by submitting false and fraudulent statements and representations about Frank and its user data, among 5 other things to potential acquiring companies, including JPMC and a bank, in order to defraud those 6 7 companies out of millions of dollars consisting of 8 the acquisition price, as well as salary, bonus and 9 other compensation paid to Javice as a retained 10 employee at the eventual acquiring company JPMC. 11 The charge in Count Four is a charge of 12 securities fraud during the same time period. 13 Charge is that the defendant engaged in a scheme to 14 defraud by submitting false statements and 15 representations about Frank and its user data, among 16 other things, to potential acquiring companies, 17 including to JPMC, to Bank One in connection with 18 the acquisition of equity shares, options and 19 warrants at Frank. 20 Counsel, have you seen this indictment? 21 MR. SPIRO: Yes, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: Have you reviewed it with your 23 client? 24 MR. SPIRO: Yes, we have. 25 THE COURT: Are you waiving the public

```
1
      reading?
 2
               MR. SPIRO: We are.
 3
               THE COURT: How does your client wish to
     plead?
 4
 5
               MR. SPIRO: Not guilty.
               THE COURT: Ms. Javice, is that correct?
 6
 7
     You wish to plead not guilty?
 8
               THE DEFENDANT: That's correct, Your Honor.
 9
               THE COURT: All right. I think that's it
10
      for the arraignment.
11
               Anything else from the Government?
12
               MS. MCLEOD: Yes, just briefly, Your Honor.
13
      Judge Hellerstein has set an initial pretrial
14
     conference for June 6 at 10:15 a.m. The Government
     would move to exclude time under the Speedy Trial
15
16
     Act to allow the Government to begin compiling,
17
     producing discovery, and to allow the defendant to
18
     begin reviewing that discovery.
19
               THE COURT: Does counsel wish to be heard
20
     on the application?
21
               MR. SPIRO: Yeah. Your Honor, I think I do
22
     need to put on the record the defense has made a
23
     discovery demand of the Government. But perhaps
24
     more importantly, we've made many Brady requests of
25
     the Government. We've been asking, frankly, from
```

the beginning, from the time that JPMorgan wanted a discount on the acquisition price, for any proof that JPMorgan relied on any of the allegations in the indictment. They produced nothing to us. We've asked the Government for the same things.

We've said to the Government, you know, that JPMorgan and its lawyers and advisors and all the people involved in this, there must be some communications in which they talk about what they relied upon. You have to turn those over. Those are Brady. We've got nothing.

And so it's a little hard for me to be consenting to time when we've been making these requests for months. And so I want to put that on the record because when Judge Hellerstein asks, I'm going to say the same thing, which is that we are aware that this information exists. I don't know whether JPMorgan is not sharing it. I don't know whether the Government hasn't gone through it yet. But right now, we don't have it, and that's an issue for us.

THE COURT: Hold on a second. If the Government wants to say something for the record, they're welcome to.

MS. MCLEOD: Just briefly, Your Honor. The

indictment was filed late last week. All of the relevant documents will be produced through Rule 16 discovery, which our obligations have just begun with the indictment. We, of course, understand and will comply with our Brady obligations, and we have had discussions with counsel about it.

Counsel for the defendant has been unable or unwilling to provide any additional information on the purported Brady, and so we've been unable to really engage meaningfully on that. But, of course, you know, I think all of these things will be discussed before Judge Hellerstein and I think it probably makes the most sense to do that before him.

THE COURT: Well, I think the only thing you need to address is the period between now and June 6th, and whether there's something unusual about this case in discovery and your obligations that should justify the speedy time exclusion.

MS. MCLEOD: It's voluminous discovery.

It's not a particularly long amount of time to run off the clock. So if Your Honor would prefer to defer that decision to Judge Hellerstein, that's, of course, within your province to do.

THE COURT: I have no idea what you're talking about. Do you want -- are you making the

1 application or not? 2 MS. MCLEOD: Yes, Your Honor. I've made 3 the application. THE COURT: Okay. So is there anything you 4 5 want to say about -- in further justification? It's not being deferred. You're making it to me. So 6 anything else you want to say in further 7 8 justification of the application in response to what 9 was already said? If not, that's fine. 10 MS. MCLEOD: Only that this is a complex 11 case. The Complaint, if Your Honor has looked at 12 it, is very lengthy. And as a result, there's quite 13 a bit of documentary discovery that needs to be 14 produced. And as Your Honor is likely familiar, in white collar cases with large volumes of documents, 15 16 there is quite a bit of discovery. There's quite a 17 bit of review of discovery that needs to be done and 18 to allow both parties to adequately prepare to consider pretrial motions, to prepare for trial. 19 20 that's the basis for the motion. 21 THE COURT: Anything else from the 22 defendant? 23 MR. SPIRO: I don't think the Government's 24 given any justification for this. So if the Court

has any questions for me. But, again, they're going

25

to say this is a simple case. They haven't been able to produce. Neither did JPMorgan to us in civil discovery, a single email, a document. I don't see any basis for an exclusion, and we maintain our objection at this time.

THE COURT: All right. Well, I'm accepting the representation about the complexity of the discovery here. So I do grant the exclusion because I find the ends of justice outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial based upon the need to produce the discovery.

There was one other thing that you reminded me of, so I'm going to take care of it now. I'm directing the prosecution to comply with its obligations under Brady v. Maryland and its progeny to disclose to the defense all information, whether admissible or not, that is favorable to the defendant, material, either to guilt or to punishment and known to the prosecution. Possible consequences for noncompliance may include dismissal of individual charges of the entire case, exclusion of evidence, and professional discipline or court sanctions on the attorneys responsible. I will be entering a written order more fully describing this obligation and the possible consequences of failing

```
to meet it, and I direct the prosecution to review
 1
 2
     and comply with that order.
 3
               Does the prosecution confirm that it
     understands its obligations?
 4
 5
               MS. MCLEOD: It does, Your Honor.
 6
               THE COURT: Okay. Anything else from the
 7
     Government?
 8
               MS. MCLEOD: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
 9
               THE COURT: From defense counsel?
               MR. SPIRO: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
10
11
               THE COURT: All right. Thank you,
12
     everyone.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Marissa Mignano, certify that the foregoing transcript of proceedings in the case of UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. CHARLIE JAVICE, Docket #23-cr-00251, was prepared using digital transcription software and is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Signature <u>Marissa Mignano</u>

12 Marissa Mignano

14 Date: May 26, 2023

_ _